

£ 15099

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LECTURE

Sidelights on the Problem. of Indian Nationality

[A STUDY OF THE SIGNIFICANCE AND VALUE
OF CULTURE IN RELATION TO POLITICS]

By

DR. ISHWAR NATH TOPA

ASSTT. PROFESSOR, INDIAN CULTURAL HISTORY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

HYDERABAD, DECCAN

ALLAHABAD LAW JOURNAL PRESS

ALLAHABAD

1933 .

India 12 As.

Foreign 1 Sh.

FOREWORD

The 'sidelights on the problem of Indian nationality' as a Osmania University extension lecture was delivered by me last year. It was then printed in the University Journal. Had it not been due to the advice and insistence of my friends I would not have undertaken to publish it. I do not at the same time repent to have taken such a step.

Its present shape in book-form is not only a mere reprint from the Osmania University College Journal but is at certain places corrected and improved.

The underlying idea in getting it reprinted in its present form is to give it a wider circulation.

I have tried to tackle the subject in a way so uncommon to the present-day Indian historians. I may submit that it was undertaken with a most diffident feeling and awareness of my limitations. But such a method of treatment of historical subjects will solve many a intricate problem of the old India without the solution of which the re-birth of the new India seems well-nigh impossible. I confess that I may have failed on account of my less scholarliness in my attempt at the interpretation of the past history of our country but the method of approaching the problem, as adopted

in the lecture, cannot be condemned. I am not in a position to judge my success or failure. I leave it to the intellectuals of this country to decide. And secondly I earnestly wish that the so-called intellectual well-wishers of our country may now undertake to solve Indian problems in the same light but in a nicer and better way.

With the conviction that a bright future of a nation much depends on the right and true interpretation of its past history I humbly present this meagre contribution to the thinking public for its appraisal, if it deserves any.

ISHWAR NATH TOPA

Allahabad

June 15, 1933

I

The sidelights on the problem of Indian nationality the subject of this evening on which I intend to speak is of very delicate and complicated nature. It is not only a problem of great importance for the right understanding of national issues but it becomes of vital significance for us the moment we begin to contribute our quota to the nationalisation of our lives.

The problem is not the mere theorisation of the basic principles of nationality, but it is more than that. It seems to me that if such an attempt is made it will befog instead of clearing our mental perspective or vision.

I may venture to say that it would be sheer waste of time on my part and a terrible and intentional infliction on you if I were to relate to you the intrinsic meaning and the philosophy of nationalism. It is so commonplace and my dilation on it would side-track us. It would be like hitting off the mark. The theory of Indian nationality is not the problem I intend to tackle. My object is simply this: We are living in an age which requires introspective cross-examination, re-shifting and re-setting. By re-shifting and re-setting I mean to say that either we have to recast or readjust

our ideas and notions about things national to the present-day need. The age in which we are at present living is not an age of our traditionalised way of thinking and living. There is a great unbridgeable gulf between the past we cherish so fondly and the present we dread so frightfully. In our lives we experience every day clashes between the two worlds—the associational and emotional on the one hand and the intellectual and pseudo-rational on the other. It is this aspect of our Indian life which is destroying the harmonies of our society. What about the future? It looms before us as a dreadful nightmare. Such a disillusionment is not due to our incapacity to face problems but to an attitude of mind, as a *fait accompli*, to be taken dogmatically and quasi-religiously. In spite of our being so modern in our intellectualised life, we are at the same time so backward in our instinct and heart that it seems difficult for us to harmonise the past with the present. This internal struggle of an average Indian has incapacitated him to a great extent in creating a life-promoting outlook on life and world. The lack of this trait has sub-consciously resulted in the sheer development of a certain type of mentality quite detrimental to our national uplift. The struggle between the head and the heart has also created chaotic and nihilistic tendencies in us. Instead of the predominance of dynamic ideas, full of vitalising force, it is the philosophy of negation and colossal indifference in matters of social importance

that is affecting the man in the Indian society. It is this aspect of the Indian problem which requires to be sympathetically probed into. To have such an objective in view would not only enable us to see things in their true colour and perspective but would make us more pliable to a better understanding and therefore would give us more insight and a breadth of vision. In a few words the whole problem resolves into a problem of psycho-social importance. Thus to my mind it appears that we have to look at society from quite a different point of view. Our adherence to such an angle of vision would not only solve the intricacies of the problem of Indian nationalism but would reveal to us certain essentials or basic factors which would not only promote the growth of nation-idea but would help in the complete nationalisation of our social and individual lives.

We have been accustomed to a certain way of thinking that India as a whole can safely be called a nation or a nation in the making. Whether India is a nation or a nation in the making, I would be dilating on it in the course of my lecture. But the attempt at the preservation of relationship between the social forces and the nationalising tendencies in the India of today which I would like to emphasise is the cardinal point of great significance. How far such forces are trying to assist the spread of the idea of nationalism in India? This is a great problem by itself and it would be my endea-

your to throw some light on this aspect of the Indian problem also. If some sort of connection between things political and things social is considered a *sine qua non* for the growth of any nation, I may then take the liberty to say that the Indian problem has also to be taken in that spirit. The harmonisation of such forces, social and political, would then open new vistas for us. The India of to-day would then have to dismantle the foundations on which she is hoping to construct the superstructure of her national life. Otherwise her condition is bound to collapse like a house of cards. The Indian struggle is at present nothing more and nothing less than political or quasi-religio-political having no real and solid basis to build her future upon. Thus the India of to-day has given ample proof of a living and standing warning to the India of tomorrow. Her pitiable condition is symptomatic of a disease which is fast corroding her socio-political life. Is this aspect of her life a product of recent political repercussions? Or had India always been in a state of chaotic conditions? The question automatically arises whether the present-day problem of India is due to some dislocation in the Indian life owing to the interpermeation of the Western culture or such a problem had always been the problem of the India of the past. For the solution of the problem one has to take his stand on the historical data available. Will that be considered our last sheet anchor? Would

the verdict of history be considered as the last word? So far as the evidence of history goes the only consolation we derive from it is that if the past is properly and sympathetically understood it will then enable us in our becoming conservant with the intellectual and socio-religious achievements which India of the past strove to attain. And thus in this way we would be able to suggest how far the general trend of life-forces and the Indian mentality of the past for the solution of so many problems of social importance could be utilised and adopted for the future guidance of India. As the present is linked with the past, so the future is dependent on the present. In the same way such a continuity of inter-relationship in the life of a nation is its salient characteristic feature *i.e.*, the preservation of harmonies, social, intellectual, religious and political as the essentials for its right and true development and understanding. It does not matter much whether such a nation is politically advanced and socially backward or *vice versa*. But what is of supreme importance is the fact that the bases of inter-relational contacts of the political and the social on the one hand and the intellectual and the religious on the other, are and should be preserved and maintained at all costs. Progress is a matter of time. But in the life of a nation any break of continuity in the cultural sense arrests its real progress and makes it tread the untrodden path, full of pitfalls and dangers. It would really be a

herculian task to compel a nation to take retrogressive steps. As the make-up of a nation is the outcome of mystified sentimentalism and emotionally worked-up associational emotions, so the work of weeding out social abuses and political disabilities automatically takes a difficult turn. Had it not been something living and life-like the matter would have been solved easily. But owing to its being life-force itself, its solution becomes all the more difficult and complicated. The reason being that life is governed by such forces that are not only of physiological nature but are psycho-pathological in bearing and significance. It would be foolhardiness on one's part if one were to diagnose the disease without taking into consideration these factors. It would be like a chase after the moon. The treatment consists in the correct diagnosis which is supposed to be half the cure. Human ailments and social diseases in the broadest sense of the term are of the same nature. The treatment ought to be the same. Moralists may ignore the intrinsic value and subtle effect of the pathognomic influence on the life of individual and society. To them ailments (human or social) are due to physical causes. But one thing remains glaringly obvious. And that is this: So long as human beings are liable to react one and the same time on physical and emotional stimuli and thus they are made pathological in their individual and social behaviour, it becomes but natural that their treatment should be broad-based. Otherwise the cure would

remain incomplete. Hence the importance of such an attitude of mind which would look at a disease from all its aspects arises.

Thus the light should be thrown from all sides on the Indian problem. It is a patent fact that the India of today is suffering and suffering terribly from socio-political and psuedo-religious causes and also from the after-effects of false intellectual interpretation of her past history which are hindering the development of an Indian nationality.

May I now be allowed to sift these causes. My approach to the problem would be of a comparative nature i.e., the India of the past and the India of the present will be the subject of thought and criticism. My intention in dealing with the past history of India is to bring to light such facts as were considered the basic factors for the development of a nationality. In this spirit I would then insist on the survey of ancient and medieval India for the solution of the problem of Indian nationality. As the India of today is trying to affect complete nationalisation in the lives of her people so the real base for the superstructure of an Indian nationality can nowhere be found except in her past history. Gentlemen, you will have patience with me when I would ask you to travel with me in a rocket which, instead of landing us on Mars, would take us to some star which is thousands of years away from us and from where we could see India as it was in her

remote and ancient past. There you will meet the great thinkers who tried to chalk out different paths on which they wanted India to run her civilisation and culture. In keeping with the terrific speed of our rocket let us make a rapid kaleidoscopic survey of all the basic principles and values in life, the embodiment of which were the great thinkers of ancient India.

II

Thus the story of the past begins. The India of the past had evolved her civilisation on quite different lines. It was always the endeavours of her political and social thinkers to find out the real basis for the stability of the society. After experimenting for a long time they arrived at conclusions to the effect that the bed-rock of all progress is to be found in the dharmic principles. The term dharmic so fondly used by them is of a very elastic nature. Its meaning is manifold and is capable of several interpretations, propounding principles not contradictory but complimentary in nature. At times these principles stand for the preservation of one set of social laws or different social laws in different places in their true setting; these stand for the right adherence to religious and ethical principles; these stand for the regulation of individual and social relationship; these stand for the promotion of harmonies in the Indian society and these stand for the bestowal on political authority a *carte blanche* for the re-establishment of social order if anti-social tendencies are found undermining the very foundations of the political and samajic life of the people. Thus it makes us realise that the dharmic principles of

ancient India had a broader range of influence and effectiveness. It encircled the whole activity of man in the society. It restricted his freedom of thought and action. This divinely ordained system of social governance was established for translating into action principles of religio-ethical nature so that man with his tribal organised life on the one hand and on the other his relationship with different strata of the samaj, willed by the divine dispensation, should live a life of peace and avoid frictions and disharmony and dissensions. So thought the thinkers of that age. They always tried their level best to keep intact inter-relationship of such a type in the society. What they really meant was that social harmony ought at all costs be preserved and maintained. In India, social systems of different types were engineered by different thinkers at different times. But their basic principles always sought to chisel off angularities in the samajic life of the people. These movements were more or less of a social character—progressive as well as reactionary in nature. According to the Buddhist phraseology progressive in the sense that they were after the equalisation of the whole man in his relationship to the samaj and reactionary in the sense that the binding tie of the dharmic obligations (though at times of a quite different colouring and import) was stressed upon for the stability of the society. There had been reaction in the minds of the people owing to the inundation of the Buddhist idea to the effect that man as

human being is the maker of his own destiny and not the gods and the Brahmanic codified and dogmatised outlook on life and God. The Buddhist ideas did go a long way in enabling a man to breathe the freshest and the purest air, free from all the Brahman-samajic contaminated ideas. The Buddhist movement was anti-social in the Brahmanic sense but not anti-social in the humanitarian sense. It was after the re-orientation of the basic principles of the samaj. It also tried, according to its own ideas, to recreate a new society on the anti-Brahmanic values in order to stabilise the foundations of the society and thus social harmony, the ideal and objective, was not lost sight of but maintained (though it was in the form of sangha organisation). Later on, other movements of dynamic force were making their existence felt in the samajic life of the people of India. By the way, the revival of the Brahmanic culture and values in life though modified in its external form yet intrinsically it upheld the same old basic ideas of the ancients. It also strove after the creation of harmonies in the society in the broadest sense of the term but succeeded to a great extent in minimising the chances of disruptive elements in its social life. Whether the basic principles of the Brahmanic ideal were good for the healthy and national development of the Indian people or they deliberately tried to poison the source of Indian life and thereby made life drab and insipid, unromantic and mechanical, I am not expected

here to deliver my final judgment on it. But one thing shines out conspicuously and that is this: Its objective was to cement more thoroughly the foundations of society—avoiding disharmonies in the samajic life. This is one aspect of the cultural attempts at the preservation of unities in the life of the people. I do not mean to say that the India of the past attempted consciously and deliberately to bring about a synthesis of the cultural forces but what she achieved was firstly, the preservation of the self-centered group life of the individual, based on tribal law and ethics and thereby harmonised the activities of the individual with that of his group life, mind, ideas, emotions, usages and customs and secondly, tried to harmonise with the group-consciousness the Brahmanic ethical laws for the general guidance of the samaj. The first attempts of the Brahmanic intellectual domination were towards the complete annihilation of the pristine, primordial and indigenous culture of the inhabitants of this country. But as it was impossible to destroy it root and branch, the only course left open to the Brahmanic mind was to recognise the force of such a culture, however, displeasing it might have been to it. Thus the infusion of the non-Brahmanic culture into the Brahmanic was bound to affect the outlook of the Brahmans. Such action and reaction are in the nature of things. The other important factor in the cultural solidarity of the ancient Indian society was the institution of caste which, instead

of being disruptive, was looked upon as the strength, the base, and the backbone of the ancients. The question arises: what is caste? How did it germinate the life-promoting tendency in the Indian society? How is it possible that caste, while creating barriers and ramifications in the samaj, indirectly helped in the promotion and stabilisation of social unities? All this sounds like a paradox. Caste as an institution of social governance was partly the result of the racial antagonism and partly of the inherent indestructibility of the power and strength of the self-centered tribal organisations. Insistence on the preservation of these two forces whether consciously or unconsciously brought about the existence of such an institution. It seems that that sense of racial superiority of the Aryans and the attempt at the preservation of their own culture, which made them affect a compromise by allowing the non-Aryan element to enter into samajic life, were the formative features of the age. The Aryan attitude towards the non-Aryan population was symptomatic of a trend of mind that the Aryans had recognised the indestructibility of their adversary's strength and force of culture. By giving them a place in the society, however low it might be, they came to the conclusion that some sort of co-operation was essential for the functioning of the society. It is true that the Aryan mind began to dictate terms, the sole object of which was the dissemination of the Aryan culture. On this aspect of

the insistence and importance of the values and superiority of their own culture, the Aryan thinkers not only tried to effect honourable or dishonourable compromise with the non-Aryans when the interpenetration seemed difficult, but the general mentality of the great thinkers had been to Aryanise the people with whom they came into contact. Thus even to this day we have before us the living Hindu social laws which were the outcome of compromises between the purely Aryan conception of ethical values in the society and the different social laws of the diverse tribal organisations. But what predominates the whole codified Hindu social laws is the Aryan stamp, the Aryan influence and the Aryan *Weltanschauung*. In this way the Aryan mind tried to harmonise discordant social factors and then helped in the promotion and perpetuation of social solidarity and social unity as a whole. Thus caste in the form of an institution of social control, while keeping intact the primordial, instinctive and natural life of the tribes, became a great asset in strengthening the bonds of the Aryan and non-Aryan cultures. Freedom was given to the tribes to live their own lives according to their own notions, ideas and traditions after having accepted the religio-intellectual domination of the Aryans.

In such a way caste as a living institution set in motion forces which circumscribed the activities of the tribal life. And it also at the same time guided, regulated and controlled the graded inter-relational con-

tacts in the light of the Aryan ethical ideas. The sense of the preordained delegation of duty towards the samaj was one of its glaring features. That being the only reason why caste, instead of disturbing the life of the people, created a sort of solidarity and stability in the samajic life. In the caste organisation there was no question of the conception of right in opposition to duty nor did the samaj concede to caste any right to sever its connection from it. This denial to caste to assert its right-to-will created less and less friction and discord and more and more attachment and harmony in the society of the Aryans and then the subservient attitude of the tribes towards the Aryans led to their complete subordination and submission. Thus caste was a great hindrance in the creation of communalism. On the contrary it counterpoised such tendencies whenever they arose. It had also neutralised the effect of those forces which tried to demolish the barriers of caste distinctions and social inequality in order to coalesce the whole society into a living whole. So the caste system was not at all conducive to the formation of nationality. Having thrown some light on the basic principles or objective of caste it becomes now easy to draw some inference from it for the understanding of our national issues. Caste as an institution of social control and guidance can only survive on two conditions: Firstly the tribal life and organisation to be kept intact by making its social laws more rigid and less elastic; and secondly

the relationship with the main source of inspiration—the Aryan gods, ethics, philosophy and importance of the Aryan outlook on life and world to be strictly maintained.

Ancient India succeeded to a great extent in keeping such cultural ties intact. But it is a great question how far modern India is going to see things through the eyes of the great thinkers of the India of the past. Whether or no such a mystical aspect of caste can work in harmony with the most rationalised and dynamic ideas of the modern age is a problem that demands solution. If either of the two factors that go to stabilise caste as a social institution gives way its very existence is threatened with death. Time is a great destructor as well as a great healer. One of the pillars of caste is giving way and its fall is a matter of time. Society will then have to say good-bye to the dear old caste system which had served her purpose well and good. That age required caste to live and thus the harmonies of the society were preserved and strengthened. Time and age change the order of things and remake man and society. So it was and is with India. As men we have to fight and as men we have to discard things which have lost their intrinsic value and utility. If dead social institutions are taken as live-institutions they would create a havoc in society. The sooner we remove them the better it would be for our healthy development either individually or socially. A rationalistic explanation for

its further preservation would not mend matters but on the contrary would complicate the whole problem. The mere attempt at the intellectualised form of reasoning would not be able to infuse life in the dead. Caste, if it is to live, must have as its source of inspiration the two factors already mentioned. But that seems impossible because the scientific outlook has destroyed the mystical nature of such institutions. The modern age is surcharged with nationalising tendencies and has succeeded in creating new notions about man's position in society. It has also developed a new sense of responsibility—not to his group-life but to society in the broadest sense of the term. The fact is that man's outlook on life and world has widened and as a result of it he is becoming more humanely human instead of being caste-ridden. How far would it be possible for him to remain caste-ridden in thought and action and at the same time be national in his sphere of activity? Such is the present-day trouble of thinkers. It is a great question and the future will unfold its solution. If facts are to be faced manly the trouble would be less and if the facts are dallied away with, then one day some sort of surgical knife will have to be taken to save the body politic from becoming septic.

After having said so much I would like to emphasise one more point in connection with the social institutions of the ancients. It has been pointed out that as the basic principles of the samajic life of ancient India

had tended towards social harmonisation so the natural outcome of such forces had been the development of a certain mentality on which the India of the past boasted and that had always been instrumental in the solution of social complications. It is the cultivated attitude of toleration. It was not only the result of social pressure or compulsion but was also due to cultivation of the assimilative spirit in the lives of the people and to social compromises affected in the samaj in order to live and let live. In other words it was made to thrive on the basis of recognition of the individual life of the groups as live-organisms and live-personalities in the samajic life, and also on the interdependence of their daily relational contacts with one and another without transgressing the social limits imposed on them in an hierarchical order. Thus we have seen that ancient India evolved her civilization on thought-lines suited to her social needs and requirements and succeeded wonderfully well in always readjusting herself to the ever-changing demands of life without destroying the fundamentals of society, because the preservation of her unities was her foremost consideration and thought. So far we have become conversant with the social philosophy of the great thinkers of ancient India who, as we have seen, were eager to see their practically idealistic system of thought assuming a materialised form.

III

Let me now, with your permission, take you to another period of Indian history which is more akin and nearer to us on account of its being our immediate past than the ancient age in which we were having a reconnoitring survey of a very short duration. This period in Indian history with which I am going to busy myself is of a very interesting and didactic nature. It is also at the same time a period in the history of our country the importance and value of which are mostly misunderstood and grossly misjudged. The misgivings and misunderstandings regarding the period (I mean the Muslim period of Indian history) are due to so many causes. Before attempting to outline the salient features of the Muslim India it would be much better to weed out misunderstandings and misgivings in order to understand sympathetically the problem in a nicer and better way. People have been made to believe that with the beginning of the Muslim raj the Hindu India was doomed to perdition. It is alleged that the Muslims who came to India as conquerors carried fire and sword with them and were instrumental in destroying the sacred foundations of the Hindu culture, in devastating the country and in decimating the population.

It is further alleged that the Islamic domination in India was based on tyranny, exploitation, expropriation, callousness, morbid sense of blood-shedding and abnormally developed perverse sense of desecrating the sacred places of the inhabitants of the country. Very few attempts have so far been made to trace out the interaction of contacts between the two cultures, Islamic and Hindu, in a harmonious manner. The 'bad taste' that one gets after reading Indian history is due not so much to the method adopted for writing history as to the entire lack of appreciation of the Islamic values in life. By this I mean to say that no sincere effort has been made to understand the basic principles on which the Islamic state and society thrived. To our great misfortune the great flaw in the mentality of the Indian historians has been the general practice of dealing in hyperboles of the most extreme kind and then drawing sweeping conclusions from them without any historical data or evidence. Their practice has also been to generalise on the grandest scale. Either distortions of historical facts or false implications and mean motives have created the most deep-seated misunderstandings in the heart of the people regarding the Muslim rule in India. The spirit of the age is also to be blamed when such histories were written because historians as men are replica of the time-spirit. To make it more understandable, the social forces of the age leave a very marked stamp on the mentality of the

historians. Age and time are forces in the form of ideas which make and unmake the mental life of the people. Age and time also dictate and dominate the world. The Indian historians were also, in the same way, moulded by such forces of modern India which has long since drifted away from its old cultural moorings. The break in the cultural life of the people of India was responsible for creating a sectarian outlook in the Indian historian and along with it misinterpretation of the time-spirit and attribution of false cultural values to the estimation of the past had also tended to the formation of separatist trend of thought in this country. Besides the achievement of a certain political object in writing history of such a nature there were other causes which did go a long way in creating misgivings in the mind of the people through the study of the history of our country.

To my mind the great cause for the deepest misunderstanding regarding the Muslim rule in India lies in the attempt on the part of the historians to impute motives of religiousness to things political. The criterion generally applied by the Indian historians to the medieval rulers of India for their real evaluation is either Muslimphil or Hinduphil (extreme in both cases). And here lies the greatest defect. Life in the medieval age ought to be judged partly by the medieval standards of ethics and common-sense and partly by the humanly treatment of the great personalities of that

age. The whole Indian medieval life was too medieval in form and spirit. Thus by applying modern standard of judgment to things medieval we are but compelled to interpret the urge and demand of the medieval life in modern spirit which is not the true psychological interpretation of the medieval soul and life. So the necessity arises to judge medieval India by the medieval standards of ethico-political nature. To put it more plainly it means that the historians failed to understand sympathetically the working of the great minds of the great Muslim rulers of India by applying false standards of judgment to the medieval social and political life and thus tried to see things of the past—religious, political and social through their own eyes and not through the eyes of the great rulers and the people of that age. It is an admitted fact that history is at times falsified truth and at times truth falsified deliberately for the sake of selfish and mean motives. Thus history becomes a treacherous weapon in the unskilled hands as it did become in the hands of the Indian historians.

It is so commonly agreed upon that in order to understand any great work of art one has to see, feel and sense the mental make-up of the artist. So it is with history. To see, to feel and to sense can also be applicable to history. It is the historian's first and foremost duty to grasp the significance of history in the above-mentioned sense. Lacking such a sympathetic outlook, these historians have made a mess of the whole thing.

If this sort of confusion-worse-confoundedness in Indian history had been of a harmless and innocuous nature, the task of re-writing the history of our country would have been simple and easy. But, on the contrary, such kind of history has done greatest of harm possible and conceivable to this country, for it precluded to the greatest extent the possibilities of a right understanding and appreciation of the contributory points of view of different people inhabiting India. Thus the writing of history in the right sense and in the right spirit for the uplift of our country is one of the greatest problems of the present-day India. Much depends on the spirit in which history is to be re-written. It would be no exaggeration to say that the making of the future is in the hands of the historians of the present-day. Their responsibility is great. And the poison they are in the habit of injecting into the samajic life of the people must be put a stop to. India of to-day, if she is to have a bright future, must face this problem of falsified history and the sooner she undertakes the work of scientific investigation in right earnest the better it would be for her future life. Otherwise things are coming to such a pass that if we let go unchecked these disruptive forces of history for long the result would be of a calamitous nature for her future social re-adjustment. Let India be saved from that catastrophe!

After having dealt with one of the causes of mis-

understanding I may venture to go a step further in search of the nature of other causes. The zeal for the spread of Islam by the sword as an actuating motive of the Muslim invasion in India, the imposition of jiziya as instrumental in bringing about the economic slavery of the people, and the destruction of temples as the conscious and deliberate attempt to undermine the religious foundations of the Hindu samajic life are considered to be the causes of misunderstanding and hatred in the heart of people of India. All these are attributed to Islam as a religion and Islam as a political power.

Indian histories are full of such vague generalisations which have created, are creating and do create misunderstandings regarding the Muslim rule in India. Is there an iota of truth in such statements? Are these based on historical data? Is it a fib or a mere figment of imagination or concoctions of the most malicious mind? I shall now take the liberty to investigate into the matter and would try to prove how far such abominable historical generalisations are true. I would try to be concise and brief in my delineation. With regard to the question of zeal for the spread of Islam by the sword as an actuating motive of the Muslim invasion in India, I would like to say that the spread of Islam had nothing to do with it. The whole matter stands thus. Before the birth of Islam Kabul with its adjoining territories was considered a part of India. Indian culture was supposed to be the culture of the people of Kabul. During

the reign of the Ghaznavis even the whole of Kabul was not Muslim. Politically the province of Kabul was very often the bone of contention. The Hindu rajas of the Punjab always tried to capture Kabul and annex it to their territory. Before and since the days of the Ghaznavis the fight for Kabul was the fight for political supremacy. This was the real cause of the first Muslim invasion from the North-West. The Ghaznavis were provoked to attack and to recapture Kabul. I may add that the first raids of Mahmud were undertaken as a retaliatory measure. This is the political side of the question. There were also other motives mixed with it. But never there is a single instance in history which can prove that the invasion had an ulterior motive *i.e.*, the spread of Islam. Had the Ghaznavis fought for the propagation of Islam there would have been instances of conversion to Islam, forced or peaceful, during the expeditions. But such is not corroborated by historical data of that period. Mahmud as a missionary of Islam stands self-condemned. The propagation of religion can never be achieved through blood and iron. If he had the cause of Islam at heart he could never have indulged in pillage and destruction of the conquered people and lands. If Mahmud had been a bigoted Muslim it would have been impossible for him to recruit Hindu Jats in his armies that were not seldom employed in the subjugation of purely Muslim country for instance Turkistan. Mah-

mud was a peculiar personality and the laws governing such a personality were also peculiar. We have evidence to say with certainty that he acted many a time contrary to the basic principles of Islam though he was a Muslim. His attacks on the Muslim countries north of Afghanistan, if judged from the Islamic standpoint, were anti-Islamic or legally un-Islamic. He did just the same thing there as he did in India. The destruction of temples in India as well as the pillage of the Muslim lands in Turkistan did not upset him as a Muslim. The acquirement of wealth from those countries—Muslim or non-Muslim was his ever-glowing passion. He might have been avaricious but his aim was to enrich and beautify Ghazni. That was his ideal and for the achievement of that ideal he did what lay in his power to do. As end justifies the means, however vicious and mean they may be, so the end he had in view justified his actions in a way. To the Ghaznavis Mahmud was a real hero; to others Muslims or non-Muslims a conquering despot. Being of such a frame of mind he acted against the ethics of man as well as the Islamic law. The promulgation or the spread of Islam as a socialising and humanising force never entered his mind nor could he ever remain faithful to the Islamic political ideals if he had wished it. He could not be bound down by any law—social, moral or religious. He was the super-man of his age and at the same time he had all the limitations. It was the cha-

racteristic feature of the age in which he lived to destroy the holy places, to slaughter people and to enslave men and women, irrespective of race, creed or religion. Such were considered the tactics of warfare. In this aspect he belonged to that age. It was not his fault that he pillaged and destroyed wherever he went but the age was to be blamed. Islam as a religion should not be made the target of attacks when Mahmud's personality is to be discussed. Such men are always law unto themselves in matters of statecraft. Such was also the attitude of other conquerors who made their way into India. The establishment of political supremacy and not the spread of Islam as a religion was their aim. After having established their supremacy in India these rulers, while waging war, were assisted by the armies of the Hindu rajas, which feature became a commonplace in the history of our country. Had there been some faintest idea of the propagation of Islam through the political agency it would have affected two very marked consequences. Firstly the help of the Hindu rajas given so often to the Muslim rulers would have been impossible simply because it would have meant the total destruction of the ethico-religious life of the rajas themselves and their subjects and secondly had these wars been of a religious nature there would have been general revolts on the part of the people of India. Such revolts to save their religion would then have been the chief feature of the age. But to our greatest satisfaction, no

such signs of revolts were visible. People found no cause to raise their banner of revolt in the name of religion against the so-called Muslim foreigners. Fights were fought on particular points political in nature. Religion could not be the cause of such wars. As the Muslim rule extends its territories we understand more clearly the real significance of such a *motif* in the times of war and thereby only one thing becomes very conspicuous. It is this: Hindu soldiers and Muslim soldiers fought shoulder to shoulder against the Muslims and Hindu and Muslim armies fought in the same manner against the Hindus. Thus this aspect of medieval India brings home to us that the struggle was purely political in nature and the Muslims were guided by political considerations and not by religious zeal and motive.

Now I may throw some light on the alleged evil consequences of jiziya as an institution for the economic slavery of the people and the destruction of temples as the policy of the state to undermine the religious foundations of the samajic life of the people. Both these problems require scientific investigation. Unless we solve this problem, we shall not be able to solve the psychological aspect of the Hindu-Muslim problem of the present-day India. Therefore its solution is pressing and urgent. Thus such a solution would not only remove misunderstanding but it would give effect to the power of heart in healing up the wounds. As it plays

an important rôle in the blending of cultures and in the creation of social harmonies so the problem cannot be solved by mere legislative enactments or conferences unless the heart dominates the mind. It is a fact that the humanising power of heart was also instrumental in the formation of the medieval culture of India.

Let me now tackle these problems one and the same time. The nature of jiziya is very simple. According to the Islamic law the zimmi are the non-Muslims, who live under the protection of the Islamic state without losing their personal liberty by paying jiziya—a very nominal sum annually demanded by government. In reality the imposition of jiziya exempts the non-Muslim from all military services to which every Muslim by birth is automatically called to. The declaration of the right of zimmihip restricts legally the exercise of the autocratic power of the Islamic state. Thus the Islamic government is by law responsible for the protection of the zimmi so far as their personal safety and security on the one hand and the freedom of worship in their sacred places on the other are concerned. The Islamic state is bound by its own religious law. It has no legal right to interfere with the religious life of the zimmi what to talk of the destruction of their sacred places. It is out of question. It is like a taboo self-imposed on the Islamic state when conditions of zimmihip are kept intact. Such is the theory and practice of jiziya as an Islamic institution. One very peculiar aspect of the

Islamic government generally overlooked is that the general imposition of jiziya on the whole non-Muslim population is not sanctioned by the law. But certain groups of the non-Muslims are exempted from paying it. The priest, the student, the unemployed, the disabled, the beggar, the pauper, women and children are required not to fulfil the conditions of zimmiship inspite of the fact that they are zimmi. It clearly shows that the major part of the zimmi population is free from tax in the form of jiziya. Thus we see that the life of the people, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, in the Islamic state is not intolerable but is given ample scope for its further development.

Let us now see how far this alleged institution of jiziya and the destruction of temples during the Muslim rule in India can be justified Islamically.

In the history of India no definite attempt was ever made by the Muslim rulers to define the status of the non-Muslim population according to the Islamic law. The only exception to this rule had been made by the Arabs who came to India in the 8th century. I can not go into the details of the Arab rule. But I may be allowed to crave your indulgence by just mentioning the historical fact that the Arabs succeeded wonderfully well in giving practical shape to basic principles of the Islamic laws by defining the status of the non-Muslims. History of the times of the Arab domination in India has evidence to prove that the condition of the

people on whom jiziya was imposed was better. Religious toleration was the order of the day. People were so favourably inclined to the Arabs that they tried to cement the foundations of the rule of the Arabs by adopting an attitude of good-will towards it, by singing praises of its justice and fairplay and by giving it their moral support. This is what the true Islam did as a political power in India.

The history of the other Muslim rulers who did not care to define the status of the non-Muslims can not be judged by the Islamic standard, though they professed Islam as their religion. And as Muslims of that age they were bound by the Islamic precepts to follow the course, if they wanted to rule a country Islamically. But to our amazement no such attempt had been made by them to have Islam as the basis of their government. Why they did not do it, we do not know. But what we know is they did not do it. Call it political considerations or foresight or call it lack of faith in themselves or say that they did not consider it wise to religionise politics. Whatever may be the cause they did not formulate, define, and demarcate the status of the non-Muslims. Therefore, the actions of these Muslim rulers are to be judged by a standard certainly not Islamic. To put it more plainly, they have to be judged as human beings are judged. And Islam as a political power and Islam as a religious force have nothing to do with the laws engineered by these great rulers of India to meet

the emergencies of time. It meant that for the consolidation of their political power they did what they thought best for the time and age. History of their times shows that jiziya was in force when temples were destroyed. These two things—imposition of jiziya on the one hand and destruction of temples on the other are incongruous and inconsistent with the Islamic ideal and law because it presupposes the recognition of the status of zimmiship in which freedom to live and worship according to their own lights is given to the non-Muslims. Such an attitude of mind on the part of the Muslim rulers is indicative of the fact that they were at times influenced and guided by the whimsicalities of the Ulamas who were always at their courts to advise them on religious matters and also on matters concerning the statecraft. These Ulamas were also at the same time out of touch with the real spirit of that age and were too dogmatic to understand and appreciate the meaning and significance of the real problem of politics, if it was in conflict with the Ulamas' own particular interpretation of Islamic precepts.

At times these Muslim rulers on their part would get enthusiastic about the glory of becoming the sponsors of the mission of Islam which they understood very imperfectly. Therefore such attempts led to their complete failure as its missionary. The result of such a haphazard way of thinking might also have been responsible for the imposition of such a form of

jiziya without making or declaring the conditions of zimmiship for the non-Muslim population. Insistence on the payment of jiziya and the destruction of temples can only be explained in such a way and in no other. Islam has clearly defined the conditions of zimmiship and if they are violated Islam as a religion cannot be held responsible for the unlawful actions of the Muslim rulers.

Now a little more about the destruction of temples. It is alleged that in the history of India the destruction of the sacred places begins with the Muslims. There is a lot of untruth in such a statement. History relates quite a different tale. Historical evidence shows that even long before the establishment of the Muslim raj a great number of the Buddhist monasteries had been demolished. Who are then responsible for their destruction? Of all the people certainly not the Muslims! This was done by the Hindus. What a tragedy of fate that the Muslim rulers are even blamed for their destruction. It is an established fact that the destruction of sacred places of the enemy was looked upon as a tactics of warfare in the medieval age. The question arises why especially the temples are to be demolished. The answer to it is simple and understandable. Temples are and were considered sacred and the idols in them were believed to have supernatural power which was supposed to protect the believers. And secondly these temples were the storehouses of wealth

and centres of influence. In war the first and foremost consideration of the invading army is always to attack the most vulnerable points of the enemy. In the medieval age by destroying temples the victory became more and more assured and certain, because the fall of the gods or idols signified the complete fall of the people. The gods were supposed to be their backbone and when the backbone gave way the morale of the people degenerated into a moral defeat. The capture of wealth, stored in temples, always kept the armies alive and the fights became more tough and severe. Such were the moves in the wars of the medieval age. The aim was to conquer the country and such were the means adopted. During the war sacred places were undoubtedly demolished. The science of war has its own laws. Religious and ethical considerations have no voice in the time of war. Either victory or defeat is the only consideration war takes into account. If after the war sacred places were demolished by the Muslim rulers, it must have been done without the sanction of the Islamic law. But history has enough evidence to show that the Muslim rulers gave grants to temples and temples were also rebuilt at the expense of the Islamic state. The 15th century Kashmir is a glaring example of it.

So far we have been dealing with a certain aspect of the Muslim rule in India which is grossly misunderstood and misjudged and the memories of which are

creating hatred and aversion in the heart of the people of India against the Muslim rulers. I do believe that I have tried to show how far it is possible to remove misunderstanding. For the true understanding of things medieval we have to apply medieval standards to judge them. And I think I have done that, though my contribution to the solution of problems of medieval India is of a humble and meagre nature. The right understanding of medieval India would to a great extent solve the most intricate problems of Indian nationality. We have seen that politics and not the religion was the guiding spirit of the medieval rulers of India so far as the welfare of the country was concerned.

So far we have been able to see the political aspect of the medieval rule in India. Let me now estimate its social and religious achievements which formed the cultural basis of that political rule. There was a complete unity and harmony between the cultural and political life of medieval India. Such a bond of relationship helped in the development and promotion of social harmonies in the life of the Indian people. And it was this aspect of medieval India which ought to become the real base for the superstructure of an Indian nationality. The Muslim government was not only based on a political basis but it also tried to make its political superstructure firm and sound with the help of a cultural basis. It is an un-

deniable fact in the history of our country that on their being thoroughly Indianised in their mind and outlook these great Muslim rulers adopted an attitude of mind which was indicative of a new objective for their government. And that was to make it more suitable to the Indian requirements and to make its existence more conducive and congenial to the cultural development of the Indian people. With the passing of time these great Muslim rulers came to two very important conclusions: Firstly for the stability of their government the intrusion or interference of the Ulamas and the influence of their school of thought on matters of state could in no way be considered wise and politic and secondly without the healthy co-operation of the Hindus the government could not only be run efficiently but would always be in a position of an unstable equilibrium. The only remedy lay in the offer on the part of the great Muslim rulers to their Hindu subjects to take not only an interest in the government of the country but participate fully and thoroughly in its working and stabilization. It meant that the welfare of the country was in the hands of the Muslims and Hindus at one and the same time. If one element was lacking it would create some dislocation which meant disruption in the long run. They arrived at this political conception in a very short time of their rule in this country.

It began with Allauddin who endeavoured to curb

the political power of the Ulamas and divorced politics from religion. He was followed by Mohammad Tughlak who also tried to reduce them to a non-entity in the political life of the state. The introduction of the Hindu element in the government was insisted upon during his reign. Such a movement found its culmination in the personability of Akbar the Great. It was he who, for the first time, in the history of our country attempted to culturise politics. Akbar represented the time-spirit of that age which was creating a new synthetical culture to be considered as the basis of politics. In this sense Akbar can truly be called our *First National Emperor* who had no other object in view than the complete harmonisation of the Hindu and Muslim cultures. And the infusion of the spirit of such a synthetical culture into the body politic was due to him and him only. Akbar realised that the real development of India—politically, socially and religiously lay in the harmonisation and blending of different cultures of India into one culture which was and is really the Indian culture. On it India of the medieval age could only thrive and prosper. And in my opinion, on the same cultural basis the India of today should endeavour to develop her national life. But in vain she is trying to build her future on those factors which are pure and simple political. It ought to be borne in mind that the Indian nationality cannot be built on a political foundation only, but must needs have a cultural basis also. As a matter of fact cul-

ture should be the real foundation for the healthy growth of Indian nationalism. Then and then only we can hope to see India becoming a nation. Without a cultural base the Indian nationality would die of spiritual, emotional and artistic starvation. Thus for the formation of an Indian nationality politics and culture are essential. One without the other would be like an edifice without a base. This is what the India of to-day is and her restlessness is indicative of too much political obsessions from which she is suffering. In vain she is trying to find cure by hypnotic spells—political in nature. The more she subjects herself to this hypnotic treatment the remoter becomes the chance of her developing a healthy national life. What she really stands in need of is a cultural cure. And in it lies her salvation. What sort of cultural cure is she in need of? And what made her to neglect such a cure from the very beginning of her political sickness? Was it her own negligence in the matter? Or was it due to some wrong diagnosis? In attempting to answer these questions I would be automatically solving the problem of Indian nationality. The past as we have just estimated has helped us in the clarification of issues, so in the same manner it will supply us clues to the solution of the present-day problem of Indian nationality.

After such an unavoidable digression from the main theme which was so essential for the clear understanding of the problem may I now be allowed to pick up the

thread of the story of medieval India. It will deal with the inter-relational contracts of the Islamic and Hindu ideas and their effect on the life of the people of the medieval age. The result of such cultural contacts was instrumental in the creation of social harmony in the samaj.

Islam as a religion preceeded the establishment of Islamic political power in India. Its earliest contacts began with southern India. Muslim merchants from the various Islamic countries came to establish commercial relations with India and the Muslim saints began visiting Ceylon that was looked upon as a holy place of pilgrimage. Thus in this way Islam came into contact with the South. Such contacts not only affected the slow and peaceful colonisation of the country by the Muslims but at the same time brought about a great intellectual awakening among the people. The honesty and integrity of the Muslim merchants and the broad humanitarian outlook and spirit of social service, irrespective of the distinction of caste or creed, of the Muslim pirs and saints were factors that influenced the lives of the people.

The result was that Islam was welcomed in the South and the historical evidence corroborates the view that Islam was made to thrive under the protection and patronage of the Hindu rajas of the South. Through the influence of the Muslim merchants and pirs on the one hand and the Hindu royal patronage, protection

and help on the other the status of Islam was enhanced in the Hindu samaj to such an extent that the intellectual Hindus of that age showed signs of interest for the right understanding of Islam. And in this way it captured the Hindu heart and succeeded to a great extent in influencing and penetrating the samajic life of the people without disturbing the essentials of social unities. Islam as an article of faith clear as a crystal and the Islamic principles of brotherhood in actual life were the two most powerful factors which helped in the peaceful change in the mentality of the Indian people and at the same time it set into motion those intellectual forces that were trying to reevaluate the old social values, without destroying the basic life of the samaj. Thus Islam spread peacefully and quietly without shedding a drop of blood in the name of religion in the South. I cannot go in all the details of the peaceful penetration of Islam in the South.

To my mind the great achievement of permanent value in the history of Islam in India was its infiltration into the samajic life in the form of contracting martial relationship with the Indian women of this country. Thus the acceptance of Indian blood on the part of the Muslims was not considered a stumbling block in the progress of Islam. Such fusion of Hindu and Muslim blood cemented the foundations of good-will, friendship and toleration and helped in the removal of the feeling of foreignness from the heart of the peo-

ple. And this factor was also instrumental in keeping intact the old social laws, customs and usages though a little modified by the Islamic influence. Thus the old social harmonies were maintained as in ancient India. Histories of the South are full of such interesting facts and those who are interested in the subject may consult them. Such was the chief feature of the history of Islam in the South.

Now the penetration of Islam in the North and its effects on the Indian society will deserve our attention. Whether it was a life-promoting force as in the South or a disruptive one is a question I would like to answer. I shall try to be very brief in its delineation. Islam followed in the wake of the Muslim political power in the North. From the 12th century onwards the coming of the pirs and sufees begins. They did their work in the same way as the saints of the South did. These saintly personalities lived under the protection and patronage of the rulers of medieval India, though they had no need of such protection and patronage. These saints had a higher mission in life and that mission was the service by the creation which means service of the creator. Histories are full of anecdotes to be taken as facts to the effect that they tried all their lives through to live up to that standard *i.e.*, that service to God could only be rendered through service to humanity. In the eyes of such saintly personalities all men are equal before God and to render any service to them, irrespective of

caste, creed, or religion, was considered by them to be the highest act of piety. They were the harbingers of humanitarian movements in India. They made the people of the medieval age believe in the efficacy of the power of heart without which devotion to God was inconceivable. They believed in the inherent capacity of the human heart and the importance of its role in spiritual life. Mere religious conversions or convictions would be of no value for the spiritual uplift of man unless and until his heart (*i.e.*, his emotional make-up) throbs with sentiments of love and service which is devotion to God. Thus these magnetic, powerful and all-human personalities of the medieval age taught India many a useful lesson. Firstly man as a religious being has a right by birth to see, to feel and to sense God. Secondly, no distinctions between man and man are to be made on account of birth, social status and profession because all men are equal before God.

It was through the peaceful efforts of such dynamic personalities that India became surcharged with powerful thought currents. Thus Indian religious leaders were born from time to time to put into practice the basic principles of these Muslim sufis. Ramanuja, Kabir, Dadu, Nanak, Chaitanya became the spiritual gurus for the general uplift of the samajic life. All these reformers tried to understand the crying need of the time—to humanise and spiritualise the whole life of man and society. It is a remarkable fact in the

social history of our country that the basic structure of their teaching was Islamic in thought. This fact is overlooked and at times passed over by the present-day historians. In medieval India it was only through the peaceful penetration of Islam that the two cardinal principles—unity of God and brotherhood of man were insisted and emphasised upon. So far as the unity of God was concerned the great Hindu thinkers and philosophers always upheld the idea of the unity of God as the chief fundamental of the religion. But to the general Hindu mass-mind the patron gods superseded the unity of God as the all-pervading force and power. It was only through the direct influence of Islam that the idea of the unity of God not in the philosophic-speculative sense but in its practical application to life was regarded as the thing in religion.

Though the great Hindu reformers of medieval India raised the banner of revolt against the caste distinctions and restrictions as a hindrance in the spiritual and social life of the people, yet this revolt against social injustice was also due to Islam. Equality of all men before God is purely an Islamic conception. It is gratifying to learn that now in a fine and nice manner these Islamic ideas were adopted by the Hindus and incorporated in their social philosophy. The fact is that these great Hindu preachers preached the social and religious philosophy of Islam through the Hindu ideology. Thus these movements became indirectly the

mouthpiece of Islam and made the people of India more prone towards the Islamic outlook on life. In this way the real India was actually influenced by the basic ideas of Islam. And it was in this realm of thought that Islam left its permanent legacy to the Indian people. This meeting of Islam and Hinduism not only brought about a new synthetical force in the samajic life but greatly assisted in the right appreciation and understanding of each other's point of view. Not only that, but attempts were made by the great thinkers of medieval India to find out a common meeting ground which would be considered as a stepping stone to nationhood. Though such attempts failed owing to the fact that the intellectual and mental make-up of the people was not such as to comprehend the instinctive urge of the great thinkers towards a higher conception of life. The age was too religious minded to see the new signs of the times. But India was already casting shadows of nationality on a spiritual and humanitarian basis. That age had also arrived at conclusions that the spiritual salvation of man to realise himself lay in his power. There was no other agency on this earth which could bring such a salvation for him without his inner craving for it. Hence it means that India has also solved the problem of religion by allotting it a niche in the human heart. And thus it became his sacred and purely personal affair. Whatever might be the status or birth, rank or profession of an individual, religion was his

own individual concern and it was not for the society to force him to follow its religious dictates. Religion, as understood by that age, was a great mystical experience and its efficacy and effectiveness could only come through that experience. India of those days chalked out a new *modus vivendi* for her people in order that their social life should become broad-based, that their intellectual life should become more free and liberal and that their religious life should become more tolerant and less bigoted. Such then were the tendencies of that age. India of to-day is in search of solutions for her problems which medieval India found out without much struggle. It was all accomplished by a mutual give-and-take sort of attitude of mind on the part of the people. Things were not rejected on account of their being Islamic in origin or nature as the India of today is doing. On the contrary it was the attitude of toleration and with it the urge of life that necessitated a synthesis of cultural forces—Hindu and Islamic, and thus it produced what was essential for life in the broadest sense. In such a way a cultural basis for the superstructure of an Indian nationality had been formed in medieval India.

IV

Now the question arises how did that age fail to develop nationality when the cementing force of culture was there? The answer is very simple. To be put in a nut-shell, the greatest hindrance in the development of an Indian nationality in the medieval age was due to the co-existence of tribal organised groups with its gods, social laws and customs. These were always moulding in a way the lives of the people and were allowing them to assert their own individual tribal personality inspite of the all-India religious awakening and religious searching for social re-valuations. These religious forces were no doubt dynamic in their nature. But instead of completely destroying the basic foundations of the tribal lives of the people these religious movements either became distinctive religious groups all by themselves or their principles—social and religious became part and parcel of the tribal lives of the people in a modified form. Thus these tribal organisations were big stumbling blocks in the headway of such a social dynamics. Such tribal organised life not only arrested the growth of such cultural forces but weakened them in the long run. Even such a dynamic force as Islam had to suffer the same fate. In this way the samajic life kept its balance and equilibrium and avoided its cataclysmic breakdown in a beautiful

way on account of its bed-rock firmness. So the idea of an Indian nationality was smothered in its embryonic form. Medieval India, being too medieval in form and spirit, failed to promote the growth of a nationality though the germs of nationality were there. The problem was left unsolved. Attempts were made in the form of a cultural synthesis as the only base for an edifice of a nationality. But the India of today has to solve the same problem though she has lost even her cultural basis. Her work is even more difficult. Firstly, she has to build up again the same old cultural basis which would be essential for the building of an Indian nationality and secondly, instead of destroying the structure of tribal organised life she has strengthened its position by her moral support. There is one great difference between the old and new India. The old India, inspite of living a life based on group-conception and consciousness, could not develop communalism because of the social pressure and cultural force. The new India, while lacking the social force and cultural basis, politicised the group-consciousness without realising the fact that if the social harmony, which, being the common feature of ancient and medieval India, was firstly the outcome of inter-relational conception of duty and obligation in the samajic life and secondly due to the recognition of the existence of an inherent right of the groups to live and let live according to their own lights and ideas, was once gone no power on earth could bring it back. I mean to say that in modern

India such a break in social harmony could not help in the growth of an all-India nationality unless and until the tribal consciousness and tribal loyalties in man were not destroyed root and branch. And that is the reason why Indian nationalism has failed to develop in the masses of the people that strong feeling of patriotic fervour which is so essential for the life of a nation. This is in turn due to the fact that the people were and are being influenced by the group-centred conceptions and still cling to the loyalties of group-life. That is the problem which the India of today has to solve before she hopes to become national in sentiment and activity. And this is her greatest difficulty too. It is our misfortune that she is still hoping to build her future firstly on the non-existence of a synthetical culture and secondly on the group-consciousness as the basis for her socio-political adjustment. Such a move on her part was and will always remain anti-national in character and sentiment. Thus such an attempt has resulted in the outburst of rank communalism and not in the development of nationalism or a nationality. It is high time if she were to re-consider and re-orientate the whole problem. She ought to take lessons from her past history and then undertake to re-adjust, re-shift and re-set her whole thoughts and ideas about the future re-construction of an Indian nationality. If she really wants to have an Indian nationality, she should act according to the lights of the past. In it lies her hope and salvation.

**PRINTED BY M. N. PANDEY, ALLAHABAD LAW JOURNAL PRESS
ALLAHABAD**

COPYRIGHT RESERVED

**PUBLISHED BY DR. ISHWAR NATH TOPA, OSMANIA UNIVERSITY
HYDERABAD**

